

4 = Outstanding
 3 = Very Good
 2 = Acceptable
 1 = Limitations
 0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3004 - Fontana Library Resource Library Expansion

Overall Rating

4

Ratings Summary

<i>BOND ACT CRITERIA</i>	<i>RATING</i>	
Population Growth		487%
Age and Condition	4	
Needs of residents/response of proposed project to needs	3	
Plan of service integrates appropriate technology	4	
Appropriateness of site	4	
Financial capacity (new libraries only)		yes

Non-Evaluative Comments

Residents of Fontana currently receive library services through a leased facility operated by the San Bernardino County Library. According to the Bond Act Regulations (Title 5, Division 2, Chapter 3, Article 1), a leased facility is considered to be an existing library only if the lease has a total duration of not less than 20 years.

Project Summary

<i>Applicant:</i>	Fontana, City of
<i>Library Jurisdiction:</i>	San Bernardino County Library
<i>Project Type/Priority</i>	New Construction of Library/1
<i>Project Square Footage:</i>	84,042
<i>State Grant Request:</i>	\$14,900,075

4 = Outstanding
 3 = Very Good
 2 = Acceptable
 1 = Limitations
 0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3004 - Fontana Library Resource Library Expansion

Age and Condition of Existing Library

Regulatory Basis: 20440, Appendices 1 & 3

RATING

4

Age Rating

4 = No Existing Facility
 4 = 1949 or older
 3 = 1950-1959
 2 = 1960-1964
 1 = 1965-1974
 0 = 1975-2003

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4

Structural Renovation Rating

4 = No Renovation
 4 = 1954 & earlier
 3 = 1955-1962
 2 = 1963-1972
 1 = 1973-1978
 0 = 1979-2003

N/A

R1	R2	R3

4 = Extremely Poor Condition
 3 = Poor condition
 2 = Acceptable condition
 1 = Good condition
 0 = Very good condition

Condition of Existing Library

1. Structural
2. Lighting
3. Energy
4. Health & Safety
5. ADA
6. Acoustical
7. Flexibility
8. Spatial Relationships
9. Site Considerations

N/A



R1	R2	R3

Rating panel comments

Library construction date: No existing library
 Library renovation date:

4 = Outstanding
 3 = Very Good
 2 = Acceptable
 1 = Limitations
 0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3004 - Fontana Library Resource Library Expansion

Needs and Response to Needs

Regulatory Basis: 20440 pp. 26, 27, 60-69

RATING

3

Community Library Needs Assessment

1. Methodology & community involvement.
2. Community analysis/community agencies & organizations, service area demographics
3. Analysis of service needs/consistency with demographics
4. Service limitations for existing facility (if applicable)
5. Space needs assessment
6. Executive summary includes description of K-12 student population and their needs

N/A

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4
4	3	3
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4

Library Plan of Service

7. How well project responds to needs of residents
8. How well project responds to needs of K-12 students as expressed in Needs Assessment
9. How well mission, roles, goals, objectives, service indicators are documented
10. How well types of services are documented
11. How well types of K-12 services are documented
12. How project fits into jurisdiction-wide Plan of Service

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	3	3
4	4	4
4	4	4
3	3	3

Library Building Program

13. How well Building Program implements Plan of Service.
14. How well Building Program documents general requirements for Library Building.
15. How well spatial relationships are described.
16. How well individual spaces are sized and described.

R1	R2	R3
3	4	3
2	2	2
4	4	4
4	4	4

Conceptual Plans

17. How well net-assignable SF on plan matches Building Program
18. How well non-assignable SF on plan matches Building Program
19. How well spatial relationships on plan match Building Program

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4

Joint Use Cooperative Agreement

20. How well roles & responsibilities are defined.
21. How clearly joint library services are described.
22. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of hours of service.
23. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of staffing/volunteers.
24. How well ownership issues are resolved
25. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of sources & uses of funding
26. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of review & modification process
27. How well agreement demonstrates a workable, mutually beneficial long-term partnership.

R1	R2	R3
3	3	3
3	3	3
3	3	3
2	2	2
4	4	4
2	2	2
2	2	2
3	3	3

4 = Outstanding
3 = Very Good
2 = Acceptable
1 = Limitations
0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3004 - Fontana Library Resource Library Expansion

Rating Panel Comments

R1:

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Have used a variety of methodologies to gather input from all segments of the community--5 community meetings, 12 focus groups, surveys, informal discussions, key informants. Data is well organized and clearly presented. Have done an excellent job at describing conditions in local schools and in identifying services that are needed. Hispanic population has grown from 36% in 1990 to 58% in 2000 and one of the community meetings was conducted for the Spanish speaking members of the community. Have provided an excellent analysis of data in this very well organized presentation and have gone to great lengths to address the needs of children and youth.

PLAN OF SERVICE

Goals and objectives are clearly written and relate directly to findings in the Needs Assessment. Objectives are measurable and service indicators are clearly client-centered. Meticulously prepared, this plan can be used by staff to implement what was identified in the Needs Assessment. Difficult to make distinction branch services and those offered by the jurisdiction and to determine relationship between the two.

BUILDING PROGRAM

The general requirements section of the program is very limited and provides relatively little detail on the critical components and systems of the public library. It is barely acceptable.

There is a spatial diagram which shows a good quick overview of the major relationships of the various divisions of the library. The spatial relationships are exceptionally well described in narrative form.

The space descriptions are extremely well documented and detailed. They also appear to be appropriately sized.

CONCEPTUAL PLANS

The floor plans provide 60,470 net assignable square footage for the two levels, and the building program requires the same net assignable square footage for these levels. The floor plans, therefore, fulfill building program requirements in an exceptional manner.

The floor plans limit non-assignable square footage for the two levels to 20,247 square. This is exactly the non-assignable square footage called for in the building program.

Except for isolated instances, the spatial relationships illustrated on the plan match perfectly with those spatial relationships indicated in the program. The instances are:

The AV Library is not adjacent to the Periodical collection; and the Periodical collection is not adjacent to the Browsing Area.

Local History is not close to Reference Services.

Children's Office and Children's Collection and Seating are not close to the Children's Desk.

JOINT USE AGREEMENT

This is a three way agreement between the school district, the city, and the county. Joint services are described but not always clear about who will be doing what. Indicate generic staffing levels but unable to determine who will actually be involved in the center. Ownership issues are clearly written. Difficult to determine funding levels since there are no specifics or any indication of in-kind contributions. The review and modification process is minimally addressed with an annual review and there does not seem to be a proactive approach nor does there seem to be any means of receiving input from the clients or a means to modify proposed services. The school district is making an attempt to provide 15 laptops, some staffing and databases. This partnering effort has the potential of providing a long term partnering effort.

4 = Outstanding
3 = Very Good
2 = Acceptable
1 = Limitations
0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3004 - Fontana Library Resource Library Expansion

R2:

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Included a broad range of types and interests of the community - an excellent cross-section. Wide variety of methods, including literature review, print & online surveys, focus groups, informal discussions, and key informant interviews. Had a large # of responses (over 2000). Comprehensive coverage with excellent documentation of what they did and the specific results of the various methods, both detailed and summary. Clear and well organized presentation. The community analysis was generally very well done; did not discuss state and regional governmental agencies that would be involved and did not list very many community organizations for a community of 130,000 population. Very well done presentation of schools impacted. Well done demographics presentation. Would have been better if they had drawn more conclusions in the community analysis re potential impacts of results discovered on library services. Excellent service needs analysis, lists many different needs resulting from the various methods, along with percentages of respondents for each element, then providing summary conclusions. Not much said re services to the disabled, particularly in technology area. Excellent analysis, overall, with needs clearly identified via the needs assessment process. Clear and comprehensive. The space needs assessment was appropriately detailed with reasonable rationales for the individual discussions. The proposed Spanish language materials allocation at 16.5% is probably fine, though seems a little low, with 20% of the population speaking primarily Spanish, and 58% identified as Hispanic in total. Did not always include information on standards used, though in most cases these appear to be those of Libris Design. The executive summary was excellent, with an excellent overview of methods, interviewees, and results, including useful information regarding K-12 student population and their needs.

PLAN OF SERVICE

Excellent executive summary. Provided a very clear connection between the goals and the needs documented in the needs assessment. Very well described. The roles were identified but were not discussed. The format of the goals, etc, was not great, but clearly connected to the established needs, and some of the objectives and service indicators were user-oriented measures. Extremely detailed and responsive to the needs. The types of services were described well and also were responsive to the needs established. The descriptions were very complete and detailed; staff should be able to use this as a blueprint for implementation. The implementation plan, itself, was excellent and detailed enough. The write-up does not really discuss the jurisdiction-wide Plan of Service per se, but does do a reasonably good job of explaining the service relationships between the library and headquarters administration.

BUILDING PROGRAM

Overall, the program does a fine job implementing the plan of service, conceptually. The general requirements section is fairly limited and seems more a document written after the building design was completed, to document how it, in very general terms, addressed all elements of the Bond Act regulations rather than a document, developed in advance of the building design, to help the architect as a guide into the important overall points to keep in mind in the design of this particular library building. Details appear only in the individual space descriptions, even when conceptually they are similar across many different spaces. No visual supervision section was included in the general requirements at all. The spatial relationships seen reasonable, clearly defined, and sound. The bubble diagram can be a helpful visual aid, though it would be clearer if distinctions between floors were shown more clearly. The space descriptions were detailed and specific. It would be preferable for ease of use by a design team and architect to have space requirements that are similar across spaces be summarized in the general requirements as well as detailed in the individual spaces.

CONCEPTUAL PLANS

The net-assignable space on the plans meets what was called for in the building program extremely well. There are a few areas where the architect went over the specified space, most notably in the Children's Collection and Seating space, the Circulation Work Area, and the Telecommunications/Data rooms, however most of these excesses are minor and do not have a major impact on the overall building's effectiveness.

The non-assignable space called for in the building program was 25% and the architect brought the plan in at just below that figure which is extremely efficient for a two story building.

Overall the conceptual plan meets the spatial relationships called for in the building program exceptionally well with a few exceptions:

The Audio-Visual Library division does not appear to be in the proximity of the Young Adult Services division.

The Children's Collection and Seating space is not adjacent to the Children's Desk.

The Children's Office is not adjacent to the Children's Desk.

The Book drop is not adjacent to the Information Desk.

The FTLC Computer Center is not adjacent to the Service Desk, but it is close.

The Fiction Collection and Seating is not particularly close to the public entrance and lobby.

4 = Outstanding
3 = Very Good
2 = Acceptable
1 = Limitations
0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3004 - Fontana Library Resource Library Expansion

The Fiction Collection and Seating is not particularly close to the public entrance and lobby.
The Loading Dock (parking garage) does not appear to be particularly close to the shipping and receiving space (2nd floor).
The Shipping and Receiving space is not close to the Friends Workroom and Storage or the General Storage spaces.
The Friend's Bookstore and the Friend's Coffee Shop are not adjacent to one another, but they are very close.
The Local History Collection and Seating area is not particularly close to the Reference Desk.
The Reference Workroom is not particularly close to the Reference Desk.
Mending and Processing is not adjacent to Shipping and Receiving, but it is close.

While this list may appear to be fairly long, it must be understood that this is a very large public library with complex services and the architect has done an admirable job of meeting most all of the critical spatial relationships. Most of the issues listed above are relatively minor relationship problems that will not hamper the efficient operation of the library by much.

JOINT USE AGREEMENT

The magnitude of the district's responsibilities is not always clear, with words such as "assist," "encourage," or "with guidance from." Clearly there is some significant level of district contribution at 2.0 FTE, but it is not clear what these will do. The joint services are reasonably clearly defined, with very good basic statements, though it would not be totally clear from this what each agency's staff would be doing, and it seems clear that the county will be doing significantly more than the district. The hours of the joint service are the same as those for the branch as a whole, so they are clearly very good. Only question is the level of staffing that will be provided specifically to these services during all of these hours. The staffing list provided is that for the branch as a whole, not just these joint services. There is excellent (2.0 FTE) contribution from the district, but it is not clear what these will actually be doing in service provision. Sources and uses of funds are adequate: the district clearly provides a lesser (though a reasonable) amount and these are dependent on grant funds. Would have been a better presentation had some level of dollar equivalents been provided. The review and modification process calls only for annual reviews by the contract administrators, with no ongoing, formal mechanism established for regular service review and evaluation to provide recommendations to the contract administrators. The agreement is clearly more dependent on the county than the district, but there are some real contributions from the district (15 laptops, databases, staffing), so this appears to have very good chances of resulting in a reasonably mutually-beneficial, long-term partnership.

4 = Outstanding
3 = Very Good
2 = Acceptable
1 = Limitations
0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3004 - Fontana Library Resource Library Expansion

R3:

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

The needs assessment process included a variety of individual and group methods to obtain input from community residents, including printed and online surveys, focus groups, stakeholder interviews and informal discussions. The documentation is very clear and well presented, demonstrating a thorough analysis. Analysis of the input and demographic information is especially well done, and logical conclusions are drawn regarding library services.

PLAN OF SERVICE

The service plan is thorough and well presented. Goals and objectives are user-oriented, very well written, and clearly tied to the needs assessment findings. Service indicators appear to be aimed at assessing both use and quality, but need to be further developed. Services are clearly described. On the whole, the staff will find this to be a valuable document to use as they implement the services.

BUILDING PROGRAM

The building program follows the requirements of the earlier planning documents very well. While all of the required elements for the general requirements section are there, they are very brief. Additional detail would assist the design team in understanding the facility needs for public libraries in general, and this library in specific. What's lacking in the general requirements section is mitigated by the especially well detailed individual space sheets. Spatial relationships are well described and are augmented by a diagram that provides a visual overview.

CONCEPTUAL PLANS

The net assignable SF on this building plan is exactly the same as the drawings. It is extremely accurate and clearly presented.

The non-assignable SF is identical in both the building plan and on the drawings.

The spatial relationships in this project are good. There are only a few exceptions noted:

- Local history not close to reference services.
- Children's collection not adjacent to desk.
- Children's office not adjacent to desk.
- Processing area not adjacent to shipping & receiving.

The minor differences in this program do not impact the function of the building.

JOINT USE AGREEMENT

Roles and responsibilities are clearly defined, and the services are fully described. The agreement specifies that the joint venture services are to be available during all open library hours, but it is unclear what staffing will be allocated to the services. Staffing for the overall library operation is given and appears to be appropriate, and the school district will provide an additional two full-time equivalents, but how they will be used is not specified. The agreement discusses funding in only general terms. The county is to fund the overall operation, the city will provide for facility maintenance, and the school district will provide "funding for supplemental staffing for joint use services," but it appears that a commitment is there to provide the joint venture services. Review and modification is to occur annually, which may not provide adequate feedback concerning the success of the services and needed modifications.

4 = Outstanding
 3 = Very Good
 2 = Acceptable
 1 = Limitations
 0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3004 - Fontana Library Resource Library Expansion

Integration of Electronic Technologies

RATING

4

Regulatory Basis: p.68, 20440, Appendix 4

Integration of Electronic Technologies

1. Appropriateness of electronic technologies in Plan of Service, based on Needs Assessment
2. How well the integration of electronic technologies is documented in Plan of Service
3. How well the integration of electronic technologies is documented in the Building Program

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4
4	4	4
3	3	3

Rating Panel Comments

R1:

The technology planning is clearly responsive to the Needs Assessment. Cite specific electronic resources and databases that related to the Plan of Service (i.e., Tutor.com/homework assistance). Lots of detail and a thorough listing of technology units in all service areas. Indicate that they plan to conduct an annual technology review to ensure that technology is kept up-to-date. Unable to determine the amount of flexibility for future technological enhancements.

R2:

There is a very clear connection to the needs assessment and to the services addressing those needs in the plan of service. This is very well documented and appropriately detailed. Technology support is extremely well integrated throughout the entirety of the plan of service and in the specific technology section. Excellent planning for the future seems to be incorporated. The building program is well done in relation to defining what needs to be done for existing technological support structures. It does not make as clear what needs to be done to ensure the future technological flexibility that is called for broadly in the general requirements section.

R3:

The importance of technology in providing library services is apparent throughout the planning documents. The needs assessment discussion incorporates insightful technology service solutions. The service plan indicates that the library will conduct an annual technology review to keep pace with rapidly changing technology. The general requirements section of the building program mentions the need for the building infrastructure to be designed to allow for reconfiguration as the need arises and that it must be able to support current technologies and provide adaptability/flexibility to incorporate future technologies; however, it does not go on to describe possible future technologies or which areas of the library may be most affected by technology. A more in-depth discussion of the current uses of technology and the library's dependence on the Internet for information resources would assist the design team in creating the infrastructure necessary for the future. Individual space sheets do a good job of describing what connectivity will be required.

4 = Outstanding
 3 = Very Good
 2 = Acceptable
 1 = Limitations
 0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3004 - Fontana Library Resource Library Expansion

Site

RATING

4

Regulatory Basis: p.39, 20440, Appendix 1

Appropriateness of Site

1. Equal access for all residents in service area.
2. Accessibility via public transit.
3. Accessibility via pedestrian and bicycle.
4. Accessibility via automobile.
5. Adequacy of automobile parking.
6. Adequacy of bicycle parking.
7. Overall parking rationale.
8. Shared parking agreement (if applicable).
9. Visibility of site & proposed library building in service area
10. How well site fits community context & planning
11. Site selection process and summary.

N/A

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	3
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
<i>N/A</i>		
4	4	3
4	4	4
4	4	4

Site Description

12. Adequacy of size of site.
13. Appropriateness of site configuration
14. Appropriateness of site/surrounding area.
15. Appropriateness of site based on placement of building, parking, access roads, pathways, expansion and parking.

R1	R2	R3
3	2	3
4	4	4
4	3	4
3	3	3

4 = Outstanding
3 = Very Good
2 = Acceptable
1 = Limitations
0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3004 - Fontana Library Resource Library Expansion

Rating Panel Comments

Drainage issues:

Geotechnical issues:

R1:

Proposed site is located in the historic downtown Civic Center area and is geographically in the center of the library service area. It is accessible to all elements of the community--those who choose to walk, bike, or take public transit such as Metrolink, a train servicing Los Angeles and San Bernardino Counties. Pedestrians will have access to 10 bus lines that stop within 1/4 mile of the Civic Center Library Site. A proposed neighborhood shuttle will serve community residents and seniors' housing residences by connecting the southern neighborhoods south of the I-10 Interstate Freeway and the central neighborhoods. The architectural design of the proposed facility will complement existing historic landmarks (Spanish Colonial). In addition there will be numerous pedestrian amenities--trees, parks,-- along with bicycle paths and secure parking. Total number of spaces for library parking will be 215 (local zoning requires 185). Subterranean parking garage will also have elevator to the library. Excellent input from the community was utilized in selection of the site (11 meetings).

R2:

The site is centrally located in the service area particularly given the population distribution and major thoroughfares. The site is located in the historic downtown civic center, which includes in addition to the proposed library site, a City Hall, Police station, community center, Chamber of Commerce, fire station, theatre and park. There is a nearby Post Office, senior citizens' housing development, as well as an elementary and middle school. There is also commercial development surrounding the site and to the north and south of the site.

The proposed library site is located on a the major north/south artery called Sierra Ave (39,000 vehicles / day at the site). The site is 2 blocks south of the intersection of Sierra & Foothill Blvd (56,600 vehicles per day) and one block north of Arrow highway (36,200 vehicles / day). The site is located between I-210 and I-10.

There are 10 transit stops within 1/4 mile of the site, and the site is two blocks from the Regional Bus Transportation Center and the Metrolink train to downtown Los Angeles.

The City is in the process of a downtown revitalization of the Civic Center. The Downtown District revitalization plan will include entertainment venues, professional offices, restaurants, commercial and retail stores, mini-parks, etc.

Immediately adjacent to the site is a multipurpose trail for both pedestrians and bicyclists that runs throughout the city on an east/west axis. There will be 48 bicycle parking spaces near to the front entrance, and 16 of the parking spaces will be protected lockers in the lower parking level.

There will be 155 on-site parking spaces primarily provided by under building parking, as well as 25 spaces off street, but within 500' of the front door of the library. There are also 35 on-street parking spaces within 500' of the front door.

The new library will have outstanding visibility given its proximity to major thoroughfares as well as being the predominant facility in the civic center.

Fontana used a formal process for planning the new Civic Center complex and locating the library by hiring RNL Design's Urban Planning studio. There were numerous workshops and public input meetings.

The conceptual plans do not show a planned future expansion of either parking or building, however there is open space in the civic center that could potentially accommodate future expansions of either if necessary.

4 = Outstanding
3 = Very Good
2 = Acceptable
1 = Limitations
0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3004 - Fontana Library Resource Library Expansion

R3:

The site is central in Fontana, in terms of street grid, public transportation, and bicycle routes; access could not be more equal. Transit center is three blocks away; local bus routes go by the Library site. The Pacific Electric right-of-way is now a bicycle and pedestrian trail, and adjoins the site. Arterials to the freeway are within two blocks, but the distance to the freeway is not indicated. Automobile parking exceeds code equivalent, through a combination of a garage underneath the Library (w/ elevator to Library level), and surface parking. There is no cutout for drop-off at library entry level, for ease of disabled access etc., although one could easily be provided. Bicycle parking is generous, and includes lockers in the underground garage.

The site is prominent within the Civic Center / Downtown context, and the entry tower architectural feature will be visible for several blocks, but not really from the major arterials. The Library is a laudable key component in revitalizing downtown - the question is, however, if you build it in a rundown area, will they come? The ease of parking will help, as will the location near that of the former main library, but until the downtown business area returns to life, the Library will be a destination trip, not combined with e.g., other shopping.

Site selection involved broad community and official input, and responds to logic and to local desires. The site is minimally able to accommodate program and parking. Massing the building at the west end of the site and having the Library entry plaza facing the parking roadway on the east makes sense. However, that results in a Sierra Ave. approach view from the west that is only minimally attractive to those coming on the collector streets. In other words, the access and arrangement is quite good, but the tight fit reflects the compromises needed to make it work. Expansion will not be at this site, but at branches in high schools (about which no other information is provided re access by general public).

4 = Outstanding
3 = Very Good
2 = Acceptable
1 = Limitations
0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3004 - Fontana Library Resource Library Expansion

Financial Capacity

Regulatory Basis: Bond Act p. 5, Section 19998 (a) (7)

Rating Panel Comments:

Applicant has committed to the on-going operation of the completed library.